

**ENSURING QUALITY TEACHING AND LEARNING
FOR
NEW JERSEY'S STUDENTS AND EDUCATORS**

**William L. Librera, Ed.D.
Commissioner of Education**

December 15, 2004

ENSURING QUALITY TEACHING AND LEARNING FOR NEW JERSEY'S STUDENTS AND EDUCATORS

Introduction

In 2001 Anne Lewis, a leading education journalist, wrote: “We face a national dilemma: we cannot afford to lose another generation of children to unenforced and mediocre standards. We must provide educators with the skills, knowledge and resources essential to construct classrooms that educate all students to high standards” (p. x.). The American public and educators speak with one voice emphasizing the importance of teacher and teaching quality. Polls reveal that Americans say the best way to improve schools is to raise teacher quality (Public Education Network and *Education Week*, 2002).

Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, and Yoon (2001) found that “the success of ambitious education reform initiatives hinges, in large part, on the qualifications and effectiveness of teachers” (p. 916). Teacher policy experts Linda Darling Hammond and Deborah Loewenberg Ball (2001) reported, “the lessons of reform to date suggest that states should be encouraged to develop systems that help teachers and principals gain the knowledge they need to teach more effectively and to redesign schools so they can help diverse student populations learn to meet the new standards” (p. 27). The New Jersey Department of Education recognized this priority and responded by defining expectations for its educators and their students. The state website features the following standards, frameworks, and planning documents:

Core Curriculum Content Standards (2004)

Standards for Professional Development for Teachers (2002)

Professional Standards for Teachers (2003)

Professional Standards for School Leaders (2003)

District Professional Development Plan Framework

(New Jersey Department of Education, 2004).

Our Challenge

Standards make a difference for students when they serve to define quality teaching and quality teachers. The primary responsibility for producing higher levels of student learning rests with the teachers. Cross (2002) affirmed this position when he wrote “what we know from educational research and policy reports is that it takes more than developing standards, aligning assessments and standards, and requiring accountability to improve student learning. To promote student learning, we must also have knowledgeable, skilled teachers in every classroom, teaching every child. And we know that it is possible to get these teachers when we improve teacher preparation, hire appropriate teachers for the classroom, and provide new and continuing teachers with rich, content-based professional development” (p. 27).

While adopting standards is a key step in education reform, it alone does not necessarily produce the results a state desires for its educators and students. New Jersey students continue to perform at higher levels, yet business and education leaders alike express the following concerns:

- Too many students are not achieving the state standards for student performance; and
- Achievement gaps among designated sub-populations are at unacceptable levels.

We must continue to strengthen our professional development efforts in this state as these efforts are essential to improving achievement for all students. Without question, quality professional development will both enhance the skills of teachers and also extend leadership opportunities for educators. Put simply, we need every student in New Jersey to have as the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (1999) calls for “... a caring and competent teacher.” To accomplish this goal we must develop and then retain exemplary teachers. Without a systemic plan for accomplishing this goal, the following challenges will persist:

- Not enough teachers who experience the forms of professional learning and support that enable them to successfully reach all students;
- Too many teachers who struggle with their classroom assignments and who lack access for support to assist them with their challenges;
- Too few outstanding teachers who are identified and tapped to provide leadership and support to the profession; and
- Not enough students and teachers who have access to the expertise of New Jersey's most successful teachers.

Because our state, in my estimation, is not utilizing the professional development, support, and recognition strategies strategically, the following situations are prevalent:

- A professional development system that more likely promotes individualized and fragmented learning when learning for school wide improvement is the goal we should be seeking.
- Professional development requirements that recommend attention to New Jersey Core Curriculum Standards when it should be required.
- Salary incentive systems that primarily recognize and reward seat time (professional development hours and/or graduate credits) as opposed to pursuit and demonstration of knowledge, skills, and best practices that most benefit students in classrooms.
- State requirements that focus teacher decision making for professional development on *“what counts”* as opposed to *“what matters.”*
- No system in place to connect “struggling” teachers who remain isolated in classrooms with “outstanding” teachers who feel frustrated with limited opportunities to “lead” and “serve.”

Clearly, our state, our educators, and our students could benefit from a new vision for professional learning and the teaching profession.

A Proposed Vision

For all students to achieve at high levels, all teachers must engage in professional learning that enables them to successfully teach all students. An improved system of professional learning and professional advancement for all teachers could position New Jersey to more effectively serve its student population and meet its academic performance goals. To accelerate the pace of this important work, I propose three new initiatives that will require some policy changes.

I. Recognize and Reward Outstanding Teaching

A new career path for teachers can ensure that New Jersey educators view a life-long career in teaching as a desirable option commensurate with other professions. In addition, employing strategies that upgrade the teaching profession can lead to desired instructional reforms and to greater teacher commitment and efficacy, which will, in turn, according to Borman and Rachubal (1999) lead to improvements in student learning. In addition, all students can benefit when outstanding teachers are identified and asked to assist the profession in ways that all classrooms benefit from outstanding teaching. States and districts across the country are employing new strategies in hopes of elevating the profession; tapping the expertise of their best teachers; serving struggling teachers; and retaining outstanding teachers. New Jersey can benefit from many of the lessons learned in these states and districts and ultimately select and apply those that will advance its vision and goals.

State Models

- Arizona (TAP and district and school performance reward systems)
- California (peer-assistance programs)
- Georgia (school-wide professional learning relicensure options) (multi-tiered teacher licenses to support teacher leadership)
- Kansas (performance-based licensure system; results-based professional development system; peer assistance and review)
- Iowa (differentiated staffing model)
- Maryland (school-wide performance bonuses)
- Minnesota (pay-for-performance pilots)
- Oklahoma (statewide peer assistance and review)
- Indiana (pay for performance pilots)

- Kentucky (school-based performance rewards)
- Missouri (career-ladder)
- Washington (multiple districts adopted peer assistance and review)

District Models

- Boston, MA (collaborative coaching)
- Cambridge, MA (peer review, evaluation and professional growth cycles)
- Columbus, OH (peer assistance and review)
- Charlotte Mecklenburg, NC (school-based rewards)
- Palm Beach County, FL (peer assistance and review)
- Douglas County, CO (pay for knowledge, skills, and performance, 10 years)
- Denver, CO (pay for performance pilot)
- Coventry, RI (knowledge and skill-based pay supplemental payments)
- Vaughn Next Century Learning Center, Los Angeles, CA (modified knowledge and skill-based performance pay system and differentiated staffing)
- Salt Lake City, UT (peer evaluation and remediation process)
- Cincinnati, OH (study of knowledge and skill-based pay system; peer coaching and intervention for struggling teachers)
- Chattanooga, TN (performance-based pay)

I know much will be learned from a systematic study of the work in other states and districts. There will be lessons to be gained from state and district leadership efforts in the areas of teacher leadership, differentiated pay systems, teacher evaluation and peer support systems, recertification strategies, and more. And while I want New Jersey leaders to study and learn from all of them, I want us to take some action now.

First, I want us to lead in the area of recognizing and rewarding our best teachers and teams of teachers. I believe we can accomplish this by creating a new voluntary certificate of advanced standing. At a minimum, this certificate would reward those teachers and teams of teachers who engage in high-quality professional development with their colleagues, demonstrate competency in New Jersey teaching standards, and document the results of their efforts at the classroom as well as school level.

I would ask representatives of higher education, the educational associations, our standards boards, and the Department of Education to design the complete system. In

my view successful teaching rests on a person's ability to impart and to develop knowledge and skills in young people and to form productive relationships with them. As a result I favor a rigorous review of a teacher with students as a part of this program. The certification could carry a designation of a period of ten years similar to the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Certification. The New Jersey option would complement rather than compete with the National Board Certification process leading to different opportunities and levels of recognition.

For teachers achieving the certificate of advanced standing, opportunities are endless to benefit the children of New Jersey. Once created, educators with this designation would be those chosen to participate in and/or lead the state programs, such as summer schools of excellence or other laboratories designed to promote excellence in teaching. Such summer programs offered in a laboratory setting could advance the collective craft and professionalism of teaching. It would also create a collegial environment that often eludes the typical classroom teacher in the typical school. These teachers could be asked to assist our teachers who struggle in classrooms. These teachers could be used in districts considering peer review and assistance programs. In addition, these teachers could be recruited to work in our schools with our most challenged populations. Special stipends might accompany such assignments. Using Teachers with Advanced Standing for selected state and district assignments removes questions about how people are chosen for special opportunities. Ultimately, as the number of teachers who acquire the certificate increases the design and implementation of the process can be turned over to these teachers.

To begin work on this initiative, two actions are required:

1. Establish the knowledge, skills, and performances expected of Teachers with Advanced Standing; and

2. Establish initial criteria for identifying, supporting, recognizing, employing, compensating, and ultimately creating a new Teacher with Advanced Standing endorsement.

II. Support and Address Struggling and Substandard Teachers

As a state, we have only been able to make minimal progress in the support of struggling or substandard teachers. We have, in my estimation, inaccurately limited the categorization of struggling or substandard teachers to those who are entering the profession. This has led to an over reliance on teacher mentoring as the primary way of bolstering those we define as most likely to need support. Mentoring, coaching, and team learning are very important and should not be restricted to only those entering the profession or entering a new school. These strategies should be a part of the culture and a basic component of the profession of teaching.

We must address the struggling and substandard teacher as a part of the work which is necessary to advance the profession and to improve teaching and learning in this state. States that require recertification of all teachers or that have requirements for advanced degrees do so as a way of reducing the probability of struggling professionals. It is my belief that such approaches are unnecessary because effective evaluation practices, along with quality professional learning and development at the school level offer a superior means to elevate teacher performance for most teachers. Such an approach does not reach all teachers, however, and we must address that in ways other than the costly, disruptive and ineffective process of tenure removal.

We should, instead, take the position that it is the ultimate responsibility of the Department of Education, not the district, to address the issue of struggling and substandard teachers. These teachers, when identified via an appropriate and effective evaluation system, should be further evaluated by an external team, consisting of teachers and state department personnel to determine whether participation in a recertification process is necessary. Such an approach would produce a performance-based system and

would also monitor district evaluation approaches which are not uniformly effective throughout the state. The recertification system should be carefully designed and implemented in order to ensure meaningful and high standards for the profession so that all students may be better served. Our present district approach and legal process for removal do not accomplish this and require change.

To begin work on this initiative, three actions are required:

1. Create a state wide approach to supporting and assisting struggling and substandard teachers;
2. Develop a new evaluation system that includes both a district evaluation process for teachers and an external evaluation process for struggling teachers; and
3. Design a recertification system for struggling teachers that makes use of a performance-based system.

III. Reorganize for Quality Professional Learning

The National Staff Development Council calls for professional development that focuses on results, is grounded in standards for students and teaching, develops deep content understanding, and occurs in the structure of teams with collective responsibility for student learning (Sparks, 2003). The NEA Foundation for the Improvement of Education (2000) found that “Schools where teachers focus on student work, interact with colleagues to plan how to improve their teaching, and continuously bring new skills and knowledge to bear on their practice are also schools that produce the best results for children” (p. 1).

The *Standards for Required Professional Development for Teachers* (Professional Teaching Standards Board, 2000) outline the elements of quality professional development. These include:

- The importance of life-long learning;
- The enhancement of knowledge of subject content;
- The need to address the school faculty at large;
- The necessity for addressing needs of both educator and school or district;
- A knowledge of conditions which affect student learning;
- Collegial and collaborative dialogue with other educators;
- Aligning professional development with state, district, school and individual accountability measures;
- Financial support, time and planning;
- The nurturing and protection of new techniques; and
- Evaluation of professional development for results.

The professional development which New Jersey requires of its educators must meet ALL these expectations as opposed to selected criteria. High-quality professional learning must be a part of every teacher's workday. Student needs must drive the decisions of districts, schools, and team level professional learning.

The research is clear that this form of professional learning produces the results we seek for teachers and students. In one of the most comprehensive studies of professional development, Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, and Yoon, (2001) found "that professional development that focuses on academic subject matter (content), gives teachers opportunities for "hands-on" work (active learning), and is integrated into the daily life of the school (coherence), is more likely to produce enhanced knowledge and skills" (p. 935).

As Sparks (1999) contends, "The rationale for the importance of teacher development is not exactly rocket science: to be successful in teaching all students to high standards, teachers need to be engaged in sustained, intellectually rigorous study of what they teach and how they teach it" (p. 48). It is my view that the department's Office of Academic and Professional Standards working with the National Staff Development

Council, the New Jersey Education Association, and the Professional Teaching Standards Board has the knowledge and skills to create the professional learning system we envision. Early work has begun on the development of policies and tools to facilitate this transition. I ask these groups and others to continue to work together to create a system that offers all our teachers the following:

- Daily opportunities for learning alongside colleagues who offer expertise and insight;
- Quality tools that guide team problem solving and professional development conversations;
- Additional support for newly-required team and school wide professional growth plans that require true collaboration;
- An evaluation system that surfaces and responds to needs of struggling teachers as well as rewards and recognizes outstanding teaching;
- Removal of requirements that encourage isolation and fragmentation; and
- Expectations that all teachers are members of learning communities.

With a move from an individualized approach to a team/school based professional learning approach, there will be a need to further examine the current evaluation system in which professional growth and evaluation are inextricably linked.

To support the transition of our state to the vision, I propose three key actions:

1. Replace the current individualized system of 100 hours for professional learning with a team and school wide learning planning process;
2. Create a Commissioner's Award for Quality Professional Development presented to districts that meet the New Jersey Standards for Professional Development and the collaborative vision for professional learning; and
3. Ensure that the new evaluation system for teachers takes into account this new collaborative vision.

Next Steps

To accelerate our efforts toward an improved system, I propose three steps:

1. Circulate this paper widely for reaction and comments to the Commissioner's Professional Development Advisory Committee, the New Jersey Professional Teaching Standards Board, the New Jersey Education Association, the New Jersey Principals and Supervisors Association, the New Jersey Association of School Administrators, the New Jersey School Boards Association, and the New Jersey Business Roundtable. The paper will also be available on the department's website. Comments will be invited for 60 days. At the conclusion of the comment period, the department will prepare a synthesis of the comments including an overall impression of the responses by the stakeholders of our system.
2. Convene a Task Force with representatives from each stakeholder group to consider the feedback and recommend next steps to pursue.
3. Determine appropriate policy changes, legislative recommendations, and program design issues and delegate to the appropriate legislative, governmental, and advisory bodies.

New Jersey can have all students and educators learning and performing at high levels. It is my belief that these proposals will move us closer to this goal.

REFERENCES

- Borman, G. & Rachuba, L. (1999, Summer). Qualifications and professional growth opportunities of teachers in high- and low-poverty elementary schools. *Journal of Negro Education*, 68(3), p. 366.
- Cross, C. (April 2002). Improving teachers quality. *American School Board Journal*, p.27.
- Darling Hammond, L. & Loewenberg Ball, D. (1999). *Teaching for high standards: What policymakers need to know and be able to do*. NCTAF and CPRE, JRE-04, p. 27.
- Firestone, W.A. & Hirsch, L.S. (2004). *A formative evaluation of the implementation of New Jersey's professional development requirements for teachers: Year 4*. NJ: Center for Educational Policy Analysis, Rutgers Graduate School of Education.
- Garet, M., Porter, A., Desimone, L., Birman, B., Yoon, K. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(4), p. 916, 935.
- Lewis, A. (2001). *Add it up: Using research to improve education for low-income and minority students*. Washington, DC: Poverty & Race Research Action Council,. p.x.
- National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (1999). *What matters most*. Washington DC: NCTAF.
- NEA Foundation for the Improvement of Education (NFIE). (2000, Fall). *Engaging public support for teachers' professional development*, No. 3, p. 1.
- Public Education Network and *Education Week*. (2002). Accountability for all: What voters want from education candidates. Retrieved from:
<http://www.publiceducation.org>

Sparks, D. (1999, November 10). Using lesson study to improve teaching. *Education Week*, p. 48.

Sparks, D. (2003). *Designing powerful professional development for teachers and principals*. Oxford, OH: NSDC.

ANNOTATED REFERENCES

Annenberg Institute for School Reform. (2002). *Collaborative coaching & learning (CCL): Change coach*. Retrieved from:

http://www.annenberginstitute.org/mediacenter/literacy_change.html

As support for the Essentials of Whole-School Improvement moves from implementation to institutionalization, developing school-based teacher leadership is key. Schools need access to expertise to help them accomplish this goal. They also need a principal-headmaster who is an active member of the ILT and supports teachers and other staff as they assume leadership roles. Collaborative Coaching and Learning (CCL) will be used in Effective Practice schools by both content and change coaches to build teacher leadership to deepen and sustain instructional improvement.

Behrendt, B. (2004, February). Career ladder for teachers passes. *St. Petersburg Times Online*. Retrieved from:

http://www.sptimes.com/2004/02/25/Citrus/Career_Ladder_for_tea.shtml

The St. Petersburg School Board met the state's deadline for adopting a new teacher pay hierarchy by approving a Career Ladder plan. The board approved the Career Ladder plan contingent on the state's funding the \$2.1 million in extra costs tied to supplements, extra staff, training and other expenses. Under the Career Ladder, four categories of teachers would be created based on experience and performance. Associate teachers would be those without a professional certificate and those who have been evaluated as low performing. Professional teachers are those who are certified. Currently all Citrus teachers would be in one of those classifications. The program would establish two higher levels of teachers: lead teachers and mentor teachers. Teachers would reach those levels based on higher educational qualifications, proven student performance gains, leadership activities, and specialized training.

Bond, L; Jorges, R.M.; Smith, T.W. and Hattie, J.A. (2002). *The Accomplished Teaching Validation Study*. Greensboro, NC: The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

This study found that National Board-certified teachers significantly outperform their peers who have not achieved National Board certification on many key dimensions of teaching expertise. In addition to evaluating the teachers against the key dimensions, researchers examined samples of student work in classes taught by National Board-certified teachers and by teachers who were not National Board-certified.

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools. (2002). *Charlotte-Mecklenburg schools incentive programs*. Retrieved from:

<http://www.cms.k12.nc.us/departments/HR/jobfair/incentive.asp>

The ABCs of Public Education is a comprehensive plan to improve public schools that is based on three goals of strong accountability: an emphasis on the basics, high educational standards, and local control of schools. Certified staff and teacher assistants in K-12 schools making expected or exemplary growth are eligible to receive cash incentive awards provided by the North Carolina General Assembly. The CMS Local Accountability Deferred Bonus is designed to attract and retain teachers at Equity *PlusII*

Schools. The SMC Master Teacher Incentive is designed to attract and retain master teachers who have demonstrated success in increasing student achievement to Equity *Plus* II Schools. To qualify for the incentive, teachers must meet stringent evaluation, education, student achievement and other requirements.

Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) retrieved from website, September 22, 2004.

http://www.ccsso.org/projects/Interstate_New_Teacher_Assessment_and_Support_Consortium/

This website describes INTASC goals, assessments, and professional development opportunities through the website homepage of the CCSSO.

CPRE. (2000). *Seven reasons to change teacher compensation*. Retrieved June 21, 2004, from <http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre/tcomp/related/general/sevenreasons.asp>

Though the current method of teacher compensation has served education well in the past, there are several reasons why it could make sense to change teacher compensation. Teacher salary increases often are not linked to organizational needs. The public feels the teacher compensation structure rewards mediocrity; changing teacher compensation can reassure the public that we value teacher performance. We need mechanisms to stimulate teacher development of knowledge and skills to teach the new curriculum standards that are being promulgated by professional content groups. Historically, changes to teacher compensation have followed changes in compensation methods for other types of employees. New forms of compensation can support the trend in education to identify, develop and recognize accomplished professional practice. New forms of teacher compensation can support standards-based reform. New forms of organization, teams, site-based management, contracting out, etc., suggest new ways to organize and manage schools.

CPRE. (2000). *Questions and Answers about Teacher Compensation and Knowledge- and Skill-Based Pay*. Retrieved September 22, 2004 from <http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre/tcomp/related/general/qa.asp>

Delisio, E. (2003). *Pay for performance: It can work – Here's how*. Retrieved June 21, 2004, from http://www.educationworld.com/a_issues/issues374c.shtml

While performance pay philosophies and plans abound; working systems are harder to find. *Education World* examines systems in two Colorado districts: Denver and Douglas County.

Delisio, E. (2003). *Pay for performance: What are the issues?* Retrieved June 21, 2004, from http://www.educationworld.com/a_issues/issues374a.shtml

Merit pay, performance pay, knowledge and skill-based pay -- they are all making news as alternatives or supplements to the traditional teacher step system. *Education World* talked with educators and analysts about these three trends in teacher pay.

Democratic Leadership Council's Online Community. (2004, April 30). *Innovating with competitive teacher pay*. Retrieved June 21, 2004, from http://www.ndol.org/ndol_ci.cfm?kaid=139&subid=273&contentid=3582

Innovating with competitive teacher pay ensures teachers are competent and links their pay to their performance. Innovative models are being implemented in Chattanooga, Tenn., North Carolina, Denver, Pennsylvania, and school districts and charter schools around the country.

Democratic Leadership Council's Online Community. (2000, May 22). *Idea of the week: A teacher career ladder based on merit*. Retrieved June 21, 2004, from http://www.ndol.org/ndol_ci.cfm?kaid=110&subid=135&contentid=393
Innovative models are being implemented in Chattanooga, TN; North Carolina; Denver, Colorado; Pennsylvania; and school districts and charter schools around the country.

DeSchryven, D. (2001, May 14). *Teacher advancement program: Creating an attractive profession*. The Doyle Report.
http://www.thedoylereport.com/spotlight?object=archive%5B%5D&content_id=1617
This essay overviews the skepticism with teacher pay reform and then considers the Milken's new Teacher Advancement Program (TAP).

Division of Teacher Quality. (2003). *South Carolina teacher advancement program (SCTAP)*. Retrieved June 21, 2004, from <http://www.scteachers.org/Tadvance/advance.cfm>
The South Carolina Teacher Advancement Program (SCTAP) being piloted in six schools is based on the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) developed in 1998 as an initiative of the Milken Family Foundation. TAP encourages teachers to grow and allows them to prosper by offering new models for professional entry and training, with new compensation and career advancement possibilities. It honors the essence while changing the structure of the teaching profession. The ultimate goal of the SCTAP is to develop policies, practices, and procedures regarding evaluation, certification, and teacher quality, which will be implemented in all of South Carolina's public schools.

Feldman, S. (2004). Rethinking teacher compensation. *American Teacher*. (March, 2004.) <http://www.mff.org/newsroom/news.taf?page=397> To pay teachers a lot more, and a lot sooner in their careers, we would have to redesign the compensation system. Along with significantly raising pay across the board, on top of the current schedules, we would have to find a way to reward different roles, responsibilities, knowledge, skills, and, yes, results. We have to see equitable pay for teachers as a part of an effort to support quality teaching and raise student achievement. A good example of this kind of thinking is on view in the Milken Family Foundation's Teacher Advancement Program (TAP).

Goorian, B. (2000, November). *Alternative teacher compensation*. ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Policy and Management.
<http://eric.uoregon.edu/publications/digests/digest142.html>
Teacher compensation is gaining renewed attention in state legislatures and school district offices as policymakers seek to attract and retain qualified individuals to teaching and also explore creative ways to promote higher educational and professional standards. This Digest examines various alternative methods of teacher compensation currently proposed or in practice in school districts around the country.

Harvard Graduate School of Education. (2003, October). *School Leadership Program*. Retrieved June 21, 2004, from http://www.gse.harvard.edu/~slp/teacher_leadership.html
The Teacher Leadership Strand of the School Leadership Program is designed for teachers who wish to extend their influence beyond the classroom's four walls without leaving classroom teaching. The strand introduces participants to a variety of new leadership roles and perspectives and provides them with the curricular, pedagogical, political, and organizational skills necessary for implementing school reforms.

Hertling, E. (1999, May). *Peer review of teachers*. *ERIC Digest, Number 126*. ED429343
Peer review is often linked to peer assistance, which helps new and veteran teachers improve their knowledge and skills. By providing support through observing, sharing ideas and skills, and recommending useful materials for study, consulting teachers strive to improve teacher quality (AFT and NEA). Summary report considers various aspects of the current system.

Kelley, C. (2000). Making merit pay work. *American School Board Journal Online Publication Anthology*. <http://www.asbj.com/schoolspending/kelley.html>
Making merit pay work focuses on why schoolwide bonuses and knowledge-and skill-based pay are good ways to compensate teachers.

Kneese, C. (2000, August). Teaching in year-round schools. *ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education*.
<http://www.kidsource.com/education/teach.year.round.html>
The year-round calendar is an increasingly popular alternative to the traditional nine-month school calendar. According to the National Association for Year-Round Education, in 1999 over 2 million students were enrolled in more than 2,900 U.S. year-round schools in 43 states, a five-fold increase in the last decade. This digest examines the benefits and challenges of teaching in year-round schools. Both single-track and multi-track year-round schedules can potentially meet the interests of teachers who want extra days and extra pay. In multi-track scheduling some teachers may elect to work 12-month contracts for up to a third more contract days and earn considerably more salary. Additionally, teachers who participate in professional development opportunities during the vacation/intersession periods are normally appropriately compensated.

MarcoPolo. (2004). About MarcoPolo professional development. Retrieved June 21, 2004, from http://www.marcopolo-education.org/pd/pd_about.aspx
The MarcoPolo Professional Development program is designed to:
Leverage a scalable training model to train the largest number of teachers and produce the greatest educational impact. Four levels of teacher leaders are identified, compensated, and supported to deliver the product.

Milken Family Foundation. (2004, September 22). Retrieved from the website homepage:
<http://www.mff.org/tap/tap.taf?page=articles&articleid=18>

The Foundation website clearly describes the Teacher Advancement Program, names the states with programs, discusses research support, and has a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) section.

Milken, L. (1999, December 5). Why not create the \$100,000 teacher? *Los Angeles Times*. <http://www.mff.org/tap/tap.taf?page=articles&articleid=18>

Good teachers are to education what education is to all other professions--the indispensable element, the sunlight and oxygen, the foundation on which everything else is built. Milken describes a way, the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) to provide high-caliber teaching talent with the working conditions, influence and status they deserve--without materially increasing school personnel budgets.

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2002, July 24). *Missouri's career ladder program*. Retrieved from:

<http://www.dese.state.mo.us/divteachqual/careerladder/career1.html>

The Career Ladder Program is a variable match program established in 1985. The purpose of the program is to reward excellent educators for the work they do over and above what is required of good educators. This website provides administrative rules for implementation.

National Education Association. *Stepping forward—Enhancing teacher quality: Peer assistance and review*. Retrieved from

<http://www.nea.org/newunion/stepfwd/enhance/peer.html>

NEA offers summary of current initiatives in states and districts throughout the country. States cited included: California, Florida, Kansas, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Ohio, Oklahoma, Utah, and Washington.

New Jersey Department of Education. (2004, September). Retrieved from

<http://www.state.nj.us/njded/educators/> or <http://www.njea.org/>

The various teaching and professional development standards were developed by the New Jersey Professional Teaching Standards Board and adopted by the New Jersey Department of Education. They are intended to produce professional development and high quality teaching that leads to the successful attainment of the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards while creating supportive and effective schools.

Odden, A, Kelley, C. (1997). Paying Teachers for What They Know and Do: New and Smarter Compensation Strategies to Improve Schools. *The Doyle Report*. Retrieved September 21, 2004 from: <http://www.thedoylereport.com/>

This archive spotlight features an excerpt on the *History of Teacher Pay* from Odden and Kelley's book.

Odden, A, Kelley, C., Heneman, H. and Milanowski, A. (2001, November). Enhancing teacher quality through knowledge- and skill-based pay. *CPRE Policy Brief RB-34*.

Retrieved from: <http://www.cpre.org/Publications/rb34.pdf>

Knowledge- and skills-based pay systems are emerging as a potentially promising way of leveraging the investment in teacher pay to improve teacher quality and to provide clearer

signals to teachers about how they should focus their professional energies. This policy brief reports on experiences in working with policymakers and studying knowledge- and skills-based pay systems. The authors provide guidance on important design issues for these systems, and recommend ways state and district policymakers can strengthen the capacity for and pursue knowledge- and skills-based pay. The report identifies seven pioneering knowledge- and skills-based pay programs in the world of K-12 education, and describes how these programs handled several key issues confronting program designers.

Public Education Network and *Education Week*. (2002). Accountability for all: What voters want from education candidates. Retrieved from:

<http://www.publiceducation.org>

USA Today Editorial. (2002, May 13). *Pay teachers their worth*. Retrieved from:

<http://www.usatoday.com/news/opinion/2002/05/14/nceditf.htm>

An annual headache for Jim Warford, the superintendent of schools in Marion County, Fla., is finding teachers for the advanced math and science courses many competitive colleges demand. The problem is pay. The most Warford can offer is \$30,549 — for 10-year veterans. Teacher quality will not improve until schools stop paying teachers alike and start paying them what they are worth.

M:\MY DOCUMENTS\PAT\commissionerpaperonpd.doc